

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1-2, 12-14, and 19-20 are amended and new claims 21-23 are added. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found at least at page 3, lines 1-2, page 4, lines 11-28, page 6, lines 23-25, and page 8, lines 22-26 of the specification. Claims 1-2, 12-14, and 19-20 have been amended to more precisely recite the novel features of the present application. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-2, 4, 13, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,804,711 to Dugan (hereafter Dugan). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dugan is directed to a resource management system that enables real-time optimization of service execution. As service objects are locally instantiated to perform call processing services upon receipt of service requests, a first tier management component tracks system loads and service usage thresholds according to business rules. When a threshold is exceeded, a second tier management component optimally determines whether an additional execution environment may be instantiated at that service node to perform the service at that node. A subset of the service status information is provided to a third tier management system component.

Dugan's system aims at managing call processing services in an efficient manner using the three tier management components, which is very different from adapting memory-resident database in a flexible service logic execution environment (FSLEE), comprising the steps of: "constructing a service table in an FSLEE application ... the FSLEE application comprises: an application framework capable of managing functionalities of the FSLEE application; a service independent building block (SIB) library that contains a set of SIBs; and a FSLEE configuration that renders each FSLEE application unique, wherein the application framework invokes a service image to execute the SIBs and perform logics of the logic service ... providing a memory based database environment (MBE) indicator to the service table, wherein the MBE indicator is a field in a record entry that differentiates an MBE service table from another service table ... providing the SIBs to access the MBE table constructed in the FSLEE application," as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Specifically, nowhere does Dugan mention "constructing a service table in an FSLEE application," as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Amended claim 1 defines a service table as "a table containing data that can be used in the logic service." Further,

amended claim 1 defines an FSLEE application as including “an application framework capable of managing functionalities of the FSLEE application; a service independent building block (SIB) library that contains a set of SIBs; and a FSLEE configuration that renders each FSLEE application unique; wherein the application framework invokes a service image to execute the SIBs and perform logics of the logic service, and the service image is a visual representation of the logic service that defines the logics for the logic service,” (emphasis added). Dugan’s system does not construct any table, let alone constructing a service table, which contain data that can be used in a logic service, in an FSLEE application as defined in amended claim 1.

Further, Dugan does not disclose or suggest “providing a memory based database environment (MBE) indicator to the service table, wherein the MBE indicator is a field in a record entry that differentiates an MBE service table from another service table,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). The underlines feature was recited in original claim 13 and was not addressed in the June 7, 2006 Office Action. The only “indicator” mentioned in Dugan is a capability indicator that signals whether the hardware and software required to run a service is available at a specific node. (See column 22, lines 9-11 of Dugan.) Nowhere does Dugan disclose or suggest an MBE indicator that differentiates an MBE service table from another service table.

Moreover, Dugan does not disclose or suggest “providing the SIBs to access the MBE table constructed in the FSLEE application,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Dugan merely mentions service independent building blocks (SIBB) at column 3, lines 9-10. However, the SIBB mentioned in Dugan are not used to access a MBE table constructed in an FSLEE application. Since Dugan does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. For example, Dugan merely mentions the phrase “time stamp,” but fails to disclose or suggest that the time stamp is attached to the MBE database records “after each access to prevent simultaneous modifications by multiple processes, wherein mismatching time stamps on a record indicates that another process has modified the record,” as recited in amended claim 2.

With respect to claim 13, for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1, Dugan does not disclose or suggest “a database configuration file providing an MBE indicator to a service table to differentiate an MBE service table from another service table, wherein the MBE service table is constructed in an FSLEE application and contains data that

can be used in a logic service; and an FSLEE application that executes the logic service, comprising a service independent building block (SIB) library containing a set of SIBs that access the MBE service table constructed in the FSLEE application, an application framework capable of managing functionalities of the FSLEE application, and a FSLEE configuration that renders each FSLEE application unique, wherein the application framework invokes a service image to execute the SIBs and perform logics of the logic service,” as recited in amended claim 13 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 13 is allowable.

With respect to claim 19, for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1, Dugan does not disclose or suggest “constructing a service table in an FSLEE application ... the FSLEE application comprises: an application framework capable of managing functionalities of the FSLEE application; a service independent building block (SIB) library that contains a set of SIBs; and a FSLEE configuration that renders each FSLEE application unique, wherein the application framework invokes a service image to execute the SIBs and perform logics of the logic service ... providing a memory based database environment (MBE) indicator to the service table, wherein the MBE indicator is a field in a record entry that differentiates an MBE service table from another service table ... providing the SIBs to access the MBE table constructed in the FSLEE application,” as recited in amended claim 19 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 19 is allowable.

Claim 20 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable claim 19 and for the additional features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 13, 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 3, 5-12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dugan in view of U.S. Patent 7,051,041 to Miller (hereafter Miller). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Miller is directed to a simplified relational database extension to extended database management (DBM) hash tables. However, Miller does not cure Dugan’s defect and does not disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claims 1 and 13. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Dugan and Miller.

Claims 3 and 5-12 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. Claims 14-18 are allowable at least because they

depend from allowable claim 13 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 5-12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

**New Claims**

New claims 21-23 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. For example, Dugan and Miller, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “the database configuration file contains entries for all service tables, and wherein each entry contains an MBE indicator,” as recited in amended claim 21. Likewise, Dugan and Miller, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “granting only a first request for locking a record when multiple lock requests are submitted,” as recited in amended claim 22. Similarly, Dugan and Miller, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “enabling a user to choose table fields specific to a service table, including enabling the user to open a SIB to edit its properties,” as recited in amended claim 23.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2006

  
Kelly Lee Kasha  
Registration No. 47,743  
**Andrews Kurth LLP**  
1350 I Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel. (202) 662-2736  
Fax (202) 662-2739